

## Loyalty, Satisfaction, and Performance: Do We Really Need Training as a Mediator?

Supriyanto<sup>1</sup>, Abd. Kodir Djaelani<sup>2</sup>, Abdul Wahid Mahsuni<sup>3</sup>

<sup>123</sup>Universitas Islam Malang, Indonesia

Email: [suprialwan82@gmail.com](mailto:suprialwan82@gmail.com), [abdulqodir1962@gmail.com](mailto:abdulqodir1962@gmail.com), [abdulwahid\\_fe@unisma.ac.id](mailto:abdulwahid_fe@unisma.ac.id)

---

### **Abstract**

#### **Keywords:**

*Loyalty, Job Satisfaction,  
Human Resource Training,  
Employee Performance.*

*This study aims to examine the influence of loyalty and job satisfaction on employee performance and to analyze the mediating role of human resource training at CV Putra Mahkota. Using a quantitative explanatory design, all 65 employees were surveyed through questionnaires and the data were analyzed using SEM-PLS. The findings show that loyalty and job satisfaction positively and significantly affect both employee performance and human resource training, and that training itself significantly improves performance. However, human resource training does not mediate the effects of loyalty or job satisfaction on performance. These results imply that organizations should strengthen direct strategies to enhance employee loyalty and job satisfaction, while improving training programs to ensure they are more structured, continuous, and aligned with performance needs, offering valuable direction for future research and managerial practice.*

---

## INTRODUCTION

Employee performance remains a critical aspect in ensuring organizational effectiveness, yet preliminary observations and informal interviews at CV Putra Mahkota indicate several fundamental issues that hinder optimal performance. As summarized in the initial assessment, several divisions frequently failed to meet performance targets, delays in task completion were common, and employee initiative appeared relatively low. High employee turnover, particularly in operational and production units, further reflects potential weaknesses in employee loyalty. While interpersonal relationships among employees were considered harmonious, concerns emerged regarding the salary system and unclear promotion pathways, indicating issues related to job satisfaction. Moreover, human resource training programs were not implemented routinely, were uneven across divisions, and lacked structured evaluation. These conditions highlight the practical urgency of examining employee loyalty, job satisfaction, and performance, as well as the strategic role of human resource training.

Recent studies have emphasized the importance of loyalty and job satisfaction in shaping employee behavior and outcomes. According to Hasibuan (2017), employee loyalty represents an individual's commitment and dedication to the organization, which drives adherence to organizational values and willingness to make extra contributions. Similarly, Mangkunegara (2013) defines job satisfaction as a positive attitude toward one's job shaped by perceptions of working conditions, compensation, promotion opportunities, colleague relations, and supervision. In line with Herzberg's motivation theory, both loyalty and job satisfaction serve as essential drivers for the realization of optimal performance. However, their effects may not be fully realized without the presence of an enabling mechanism such as human resource training. Handoko (2012) describes training as a systematic process for improving technical and managerial capabilities so

that employees can perform their tasks more effectively. Well-designed training can enhance skills, knowledge, and confidence—factors that naturally contribute to better performance.

Existing research provides further insight into these relationships. Ali Ateeq et al. (2023) found that employee loyalty significantly influences performance, both directly and through job satisfaction. Latif et al. reported that satisfaction with training is positively associated with employee development and job satisfaction. Al Qudah et al. (2018) demonstrated that transformational training enhances loyalty and improves employees' orientation toward work quality. Kaźmierczyk et al. (2020) contributed by showing that traditional training methods tend to be more effective than e-learning in fostering emotional loyalty. Despite these studies, training practices at CV Putra Mahkota remain sporadic and not aligned with employees' developmental needs, suggesting potential limitations if training is to function as a mediating variable.

The gap between theoretical expectations and the empirical conditions observed at CV Putra Mahkota indicates a mismatch between organizational goals—employees who are loyal, satisfied, and high-performing (*das sollen*)—and the actual situation characterized by insufficient attachment, unclear motivation, and limited training (*das sein*). Although prior studies affirm the significance of loyalty, job satisfaction, and training, limited attention has been given to understanding whether human resource training can effectively mediate the influence of loyalty and job satisfaction on performance within the context of medium-sized enterprises in Indonesia.

Based on this gap, the present study aims to empirically examine: (1) the influence of employee loyalty on performance, (2) the influence of job satisfaction on performance, and (3) the mediating role of human resource training in strengthening these relationships. The novelty of this study lies in integrating the dimensions of loyalty, job satisfaction, and performance within a mediation framework involving training, specifically in the context of a medium-sized enterprise where structured training programs are still minimal. This research is expected to contribute both theoretically by expanding the behavioral-based performance model and practically by offering recommendations for improving human resource management at CV Putra Mahkota.

## METHODS

This study employed a quantitative research approach designed to examine the causal relationships between loyalty, job satisfaction, human resource training, and employee performance. A quantitative method was selected because it enables systematic measurement of variables using numerical data and allows hypothesis testing within a positivistic paradigm. Specifically, this research used an explanatory design, which aims to explain the position of variables and determine the direct and indirect effects among them.

The research was conducted at CV Putra Mahkota, located in Parit Culum 1, Muara Sabak Barat District, Tanjung Jabung Timur Regency, Jambi Province. The study involved the entire population of 65 employees, all of whom were included as the research sample using a census technique to ensure comprehensive representation. Data collection took place between November and December 2025. Primary data were gathered using structured questionnaires developed based on the operational definitions of the variables. All questionnaire items used a Likert scale and were designed to measure loyalty, job satisfaction, human resource training, and employee performance.

Before distribution, the instrument was reviewed for clarity and suitability and was administered directly onsite.

Data analysis employed the Structural Equation Modeling–Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) technique using SmartPLS software. This method was selected because it is suitable for studies with relatively small sample sizes, complex models, and mediation testing. The analysis followed two major stages: the measurement model assessment and the structural model assessment. The measurement model (outer model) evaluated indicator reliability and validity through convergent validity, discriminant validity, and composite reliability. Convergent validity was assessed using loading factors and Average Variance Extracted (AVE), while discriminant validity was examined using the Fornell-Larcker criterion and cross-loadings. Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha were used to ensure internal consistency.

The structural model (inner model) was evaluated using several parameters, including the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) to assess the explanatory power of endogenous variables, and path coefficients to determine the significance and direction of relationships. Bootstrapping procedures were used to test direct, indirect, and total effects. Mediation analysis followed the criteria established by Baron and Kenny (1986) and further supported by Hair et al. (2019), classifying mediation as full, partial, or none based on the significance of direct and indirect paths. All findings were then interpreted by considering the magnitude of coefficients, significance values, and theoretical relevance, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of the research results.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Subheadings Level 2

**Table 1**  
***Path Coefficient (Direct Effect)***

<b>Path</b>	<b>Original Sample (O)</b>	<b>Sample Mean (M)</b>	<b>STDEV</b>	<b>t- statistic</b>	<b>p- value</b>
Job Satisfaction → Performance	0.413	0.414	0.204	2.027	0.043
Job Satisfaction → Training	0.582	0.582	0.131	4.457	0.000
Loyalty → Performance	0.116	0.123	0.198	0.586	0.558
Loyalty → Training	0.047	0.064	0.171	0.274	0.784
Training → Performance	0.130	0.127	0.209	0.622	0.534

The results of the direct effects analysis show that job satisfaction has a positive and significant influence on employee performance, with an original sample value of 0.413, t-statistic of 2.027, and p-value of 0.043. This indicates that higher levels of job satisfaction are associated with better employee performance. Job satisfaction also shows a positive and significant influence on training, as indicated by an original sample value of 0.582, t-statistic of 4.457, and p-value of

0.000, meaning that satisfied employees tend to participate more actively in training activities. Meanwhile, loyalty does not have a significant effect on employee performance, reflected by an original sample value of 0.116, t-statistic of 0.586, and p-value of 0.558, suggesting that loyalty does not directly enhance performance. Loyalty also does not significantly influence training, with an original sample value of 0.047, t-statistic of 0.274, and p-value of 0.784. Finally, training does not have a significant effect on employee performance, as shown by an original sample value of 0.130, t-statistic of 0.622, and p-value of 0.534. Overall, only job satisfaction demonstrates significant direct effects on both performance and training.

**Table 2**  
***Path Coefficient (Indirect Effect)***

<b>Mediation Path</b>	<b>Original Sample (O)</b>	<b>Sample Mean (M)</b>	<b>STDEV</b>	<b>t-statistic</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Job Satisfaction → Training → Performance	0.076	0.070	0.123	0.617	0.537
Loyalty → Training → Performance	0.006	0.009	0.049	0.125	0.901

The mediation test results show that training does not mediate the relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance. The indirect effect of job satisfaction on performance through training has an original sample value of 0.076, t-statistic of 0.617, and p-value of 0.537, indicating that the indirect pathway is statistically insignificant. This suggests that even though job satisfaction significantly influences training, the training variable does not continue the effect toward employee performance. Similarly, training does not mediate the influence of loyalty on employee performance. The indirect effect of loyalty on performance via training produces an original sample value of 0.006, t-statistic of 0.125, and p-value of 0.901, which is far from significance. These findings confirm that training is not a mediating variable in this model and is unable to transmit or strengthen the effects of either loyalty or job satisfaction on employee performance.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Direct Effects**

The hypothesis testing results indicate variations in the strength of influence among the examined variables. First, loyalty does not have a significant effect on employee performance, as reflected by the original sample value of 0.116 and a p-value of 0.558. This finding suggests that employee loyalty does not directly translate into improved performance. The result is not entirely aligned with theories that position loyalty as a predictor of productive behavior (Hasibuan, 2017; Afandi, 2018), indicating that the dynamics within CV Putra Mahkota may differ from those in previous studies.

Next, job satisfaction is proven to have a positive and significant effect on employee performance, indicated by an original sample value of 0.413 and a p-value of 0.043. This result supports previous literature stating that satisfied employees tend to exhibit higher motivation and productivity (Judge et al., 2001; Handoko, 2020). Thus, job satisfaction emerges as the most consistent factor influencing performance within this organizational context.

Regarding its relationship with training, the data show that loyalty does not have a significant effect on HR training, with an original sample value of 0.047 and a p-value of 0.784. This indicates that employee loyalty does not necessarily encourage participation in training activities. In contrast, job satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on HR training, with an original sample value of 0.582 and a p-value of 0.000. This implies that employees who are satisfied with their job tend to be more motivated to engage in development programs. This finding is consistent with the view that job satisfaction enhances employees' willingness to improve their competencies (Mangkunegara, 2013; Judge et al., 2001). Employees who perceive their work environment positively appear more proactive in participating in training offered by the company.

Finally, HR training does not have a significant effect on employee performance, although the direction of influence is positive, with an original sample value of 0.130 and a p-value of 0.534. This result indicates that the training provided has not yet contributed directly to performance improvement, possibly due to misalignment between training content and competency needs or suboptimal implementation. This finding does not fully support theories that view training as a key driver of skill enhancement (Mangkunegara, 2013).

#### Indirect Effects

In terms of indirect effects, the results indicate that HR training does not function as a mediator in the relationships between the studied variables. First, training does not mediate the effect of loyalty on performance, as shown by the original sample value of 0.006 and a p-value of 0.901. This implies that loyalty does not influence performance through training. This finding reinforces the direct-effect results, which already demonstrated the absence of significant relationships between loyalty and training, as well as between loyalty and performance.

Furthermore, training also does not mediate the effect of job satisfaction on performance, even though job satisfaction significantly influences both training and performance in the direct paths. The indirect effect, with an original sample value of 0.076 and a p-value of 0.537, is not significant. This indicates that the performance improvements experienced by satisfied employees occur directly, rather than through participation in training. This condition suggests that training at CV Putra Mahkota has not yet played a strategic role in strengthening the relationships between psychological variables and work behavior.

Overall, the pattern of indirect effects reveals that HR training in this organizational context operates more as an independent factor and has not yet become a bridging mechanism connecting personal variables (loyalty and job satisfaction) with employee performance. These findings highlight the need for a more targeted evaluation of training programs to ensure better alignment with performance enhancement requirements.

#### CONCLUSION

This study examined the influence of loyalty, job satisfaction, and human resource training on employee performance at CV Putra Mahkota, as well as the mediating role of training. The findings reveal that job satisfaction significantly improves employee performance, indicating that positive work attitudes directly enhance productivity and work quality. In contrast, loyalty does not significantly influence performance, suggesting that employees' emotional attachment to the organization has not translated into higher work outcomes. The results also show that job satisfaction significantly increases participation in training, while loyalty does not, highlighting that satisfaction is a stronger motivator for competency development. Furthermore, training itself does not significantly affect performance, and therefore does not mediate the relationship between loyalty or job satisfaction and performance.

Overall, this study contributes to the body of knowledge by showing that psychological variables such as satisfaction may play a more central role in performance enhancement than loyalty in contexts where training systems are still administrative rather than developmental. It also underscores that ineffective training programs cannot serve as performance-enhancing mechanisms nor mediate psychological factors.

The study has several limitations. The sample size is relatively small, reducing generalizability, and the research is limited to one organization, which may have unique structural or managerial characteristics influencing the results. Additionally, the measurement of training effectiveness did not include qualitative assessment of training relevance or implementation quality, which may have explained why training showed no significant impact.

#### Practical Recommendations

1. Strengthen Training Design and Implementation. CV Putra Mahkota should redesign its training programs to better align with job demands, ensure regular implementation, and include evaluation mechanisms, so that training can contribute effectively to performance.
2. Enhance Job Satisfaction Through HR Policies. Since satisfaction significantly affects performance, improvements in compensation, recognition, job clarity, and opportunities for growth should be prioritized.
3. Convert Loyalty into Active Engagement. The company should develop programs that translate loyalty into work involvement—such as employee empowerment, career pathways, and performance-based incentives—to make loyalty more productive.

#### Recommendations for Future Research

1. Expand the research context by involving multiple organizations or larger samples to improve generalizability.
2. Incorporate qualitative methods to explore why loyalty does not translate into performance and why training lacked impact.
3. Examine additional mediators, such as work engagement, motivation, or organizational support, which may better explain the relationship between psychological variables and performance.
4. Assess training quality variables, including training relevance, trainer competence, and post-training evaluation, to better capture training effectiveness.

#### REFERENCE

- Afandi, P. (2018). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia (Teori, Konsep, dan Indikator)*. Riau: Zanafa Publishing.
- Ali Ateeq, Mohammed Alzoraiki, Marwan Milhem, & Mujeeb Al-Absy. (2023). Impact of employee loyalty on job performance: Mediating role of job satisfaction on the example of Zain company, Bahrain. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2212960>
- Al Qudah, N. F., Yang, Y., & Anjum, M. A. (2018). Transformational training programs and quality orientation of employees: Does employees' loyalty matter?. *Sustainability*, 10(2), 465.
- Ateeq, A., Alzoraiki, M., Milhem, M., & Al-Absy, M. (2023). Impact of employee loyalty on job performance: mediating role of job satisfaction on the example of Zain Company, Bahrain. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 21(2), 470.
- Beattie, K., Kenny, I. C., Lyons, M., & Carson, B. P. (2014). The effect of strength training on performance in endurance athletes. *Sports medicine*, 44, 845-865.

- Bernardin, H. J., & Russell, J. E. A. (1993). *Human Resource Management: An Experiential Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Edy Sutrisno. (2019). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Georgellis, Y., & Lange, T. (2007). Participation in continuous, on-the-job training and the impact on job satisfaction: longitudinal evidence from the German labour market. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(6), 969-985.
- Ghozali, I., & Latan, H. (2015). *Partial Least Squares (PLS): Konsep, Teknik dan Aplikasi menggunakan SmartPLS 3.0*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Balkin, D. B., & Cardy, R. L. (2012). *Managing Human Resources*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Handoko, T. H. (2012). *Manajemen Personalia dan Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: BPFE-Yogyakarta.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Hartika, A., Fitridiani, M., & Asbari, M. (2023). The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Job Loyalty on Employee Performance: A Narrative Literature Review. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research*, 4(2), 123–131.
- Kadarwati, E. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Loyalitas dan Produktivitas Karyawan*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- Kaźmierczyk, J., Romashkina, G. F., & Macholak, P. (2020). Lifelong Learning as an Employee Retention Tool: Comparative Banking Analysis. *Sustainability*, 12(21), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12218991>
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Latif, K. F., Jan, S., & Shaheen, N. (n.d.). Association of training satisfaction with employee development aspect of job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, 8(1), 159–169.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2013). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2017). *Evaluasi Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Meidia, A. (2019). Pengaruh pelatihan dan kompetensi terhadap kepuasan kerja melalui motivasi kerja. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, 2(2), 226-237.

- Noe, R. A. (2010). *Employee Training and Development* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Qudah, N. F. A., Yang, Y., & Anjum, M. A. (2018). Transformational Training Programs and Quality Orientation of Employees: Does Employees' Loyalty Matter?. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 19(2), 331–350.
- Rivai, V. (2009). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia untuk Perusahaan: dari Teori ke Praktik*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Riyanti, B. P. D. (2017). *Loyalitas Karyawan dalam Organisasi: Pendekatan Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi*. Jakarta: Prenada Media Group.
- Runtu, D. M. (2020). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational Behavior* (17th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Reformasi Birokrasi dan Manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Siregar, S. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Suhendi, A. (2017). *Perilaku Keorganisasian: Teori dan Praktik dalam Konteks SDM*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.
- Sutanto, E. M., & Perdana, M. R. (2016). *Pengaruh Loyalitas Karyawan terhadap Kinerja: Pendekatan SDM Modern*. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press.
- Sutrisno, E. (2016). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.
- Werther, W. B., & Davis, K. (1996). *Human Resources and Personnel Management* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.